

**REMARKS**

Claims 7 and 9-12 are pending. By this Amendment, the specification and claims 7 and 11 have been amended and claims 8 and 12 are canceled. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

At the outset, Applicants respectfully note that the specification has been amended to correct a spelling error in paragraph [0017] and to replace paragraphs [0026] through [0050] due to inadvertent formatting and omissions compared to the priority document. The changes correspond to paragraphs beginning at page 6, line 29 to page 9 of the original priority document. In particular, please note that the Equations 1-6 were inadvertently omitted from the English language translation, but they are clearly shown in the priority document.

Claim 12 was objected to under 37 CFR §1.75(c) as failing to specify any specific relationship between the axial displacement and the spring stiffness. Claim 12 is canceled.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. By this Amendment, claim 11 has been amended to eliminate the term “relatively low” in favor of a new definition.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 7-9 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Rumswinkel (DE 1143578). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Rumswinkel does not teach or disclose the subject matter of independent claim 7. For example, Rumswinkel does not teach that, when in the center position of the armature part, the point of application of the spring on the armature part is displaced axially by a predetermined distance in relation to its clamping position.

Instead, DE ‘578 teaches an oscillating armature drive system for dry shaving appliances, in which the point of application of the spring on the armature part is not displaced axially by a predetermined distance in relation to its clamping position. In DE ‘578, the armature part (2, 3) is shown in its rest position in Figures 1-3. As soon as the

armature part is excited, forces from springs 4 are applied thereto. In particular, forces from the springs 4 are applied to the armature part when the armature part is in its center position. As described in paragraph 7 of the original specification, the center position of the armature part is understood to be the position of the armature part which is adopted during oscillation between the two maximum lateral deflection positions of the armature part. The armature part of DE '578 is subject to forces from springs 4 when in its center position. By this Amendment, the definition of the center position has been added to claim 7, for clarification purposes.

Further, DE '578 does not teach that the spring is configured as a leaf spring tensioned transverse to the direction of the armature part.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Zabar (U.S. Patent No. 6,323,568) in view of Rumswinkel. This rejection is respectfully traversed as it depends from claim 7 and is patentable by virtue of that dependency. In addition, the Examiner apparently admits that Zabar does not disclose that in the center position of the armature part, the point of application of the spring in the armature part is displaced axially by a predetermined distance in relation to its clamping position. DE '578 was relied upon to make up for this deficiency, but in fact teaches that forces from torsion springs 4 are applied to the armature part in the center position.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over DE '578. Claim 12 is canceled.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully request entry of the present Amendment. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned. If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

/James E. Howard/

James E. Howard

Registration No. 39,715

September 21, 2009

BSH Home Appliances Corporation  
100 Bosch Blvd.  
New Bern, NC 28562  
Phone: 252-639-7644  
Fax: 714-845-2807  
james.howard@bshg.com